Contractor Performance Assessment Review Supply/System (CPARS) Form

Evaluation of Performance (Source Selection Information)
(See FAR 42.15 and NFS 1842.15)

CONTRACT/PO NO.	☐ INITIAL ☐ INTERMEDIATE ☐ FINAL	CONTRACTOR		EVALUATION PERIOD	
A. TECHNICAL (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
1. Product Performance (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
2. Systems Engineering (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
3. Software Engineering (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
4. Logistics Support/Sustainment (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
5. Product Assurance (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐

6. Other Technical Performance (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
B. SCHEDULE (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
C. COST CONTROL (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
D. MANAGEMENT (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
1. Management Responsiveness (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
2. Subcontract Management (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
3. Program and Other Management (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐
E. OTHER AREA (Rating 1-5) Narrative:	1. Unsatisfactory ☐	2. Marginal ☐	3. Satisfactory ☐	4. Very Good ☐	5. Exceptional ☐

F. EVALUATOR STATMENT

Given what I know today about the contractor's ability to execute what they promised in their proposal,

I (check one) ☐ definitely would not, ☐ probably would not, ☐ might or might not, ☐ probably would or

☐ definitely would award to them today, given that I had a choice.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING A SUPPLY/SYSTEMS CPAR FORM

Evaluation Areas. Evaluate each area based on the following criteria:

Each area assessment must be based on objective data. Facts to support specific areas of evaluation must be requested from the contracting officer and other government specialists familiar with the contractor's performance on the contract under review. Such specialists may, for example, be from engineering, manufacturing, quality, logistics (including provisioning), contract administration services, maintenance, security, data, etc.

The amount of risk inherent in the effort should be recognized as a significant factor and taken into account when assessing the contractor's performance. For example, if a contractor meets an extremely tight schedule, an exceptional rating may be appropriate, or meeting a tight schedule with few delinquencies, a satisfactory rating with an upward arrow assessment may be given in recognition of the inherent schedule risk. When a contractor identifies significant technical risk and takes action to abate those risks, the effectiveness of these actions should be included in the narrative supporting the ratings from the specific area being evaluated.

The CPAR is designed to assess prime contractor performance. However, in those evaluation areas where subcontractor actions have significantly influenced the prime contractor's performance in a negative or positive way, record the subcontractor actions with the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager narrative.

Many of the evaluation areas represent groupings of diverse elements. The COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager should consider each element and use the area rating to highlight significant issues. In addition, the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager should clearly focus on the contractor's "results," as they may be appropriate for the period being assessed, in determining the overall area rating.

Evaluate all areas that pertain to the contract under evaluation, unless they are not applicable – "N/A".

When performance has changed from one period to another such that a change in rating results, the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager narrative must address each change.

The COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager should use customary industry quantitative measures where they are applicable if the contract is for commercial products.

RATINGS WILL BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DEFINITIONS DESCRIBED BELOW.

Exceptional (Blue). Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions were highly effective.

Very Good (Gold). Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions were effective.

Satisfactory (Green). Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions were satisfactory.

Marginal (Yellow). Performance barely meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects a serious problem for which corrective actions have not yet been identified, appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

Unsatisfactory (Red). Performance did not meet some contractual requirement and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects serious problem(s) for which corrective actions were ineffective.

NOTE 1: Upward or downward arrows may be used to indicate an improving or worsening trend insufficient to change the assessment status.

NOTE 2: An asterisk may be used to indicate significant benefits or detriments.

NOTE 3: N/A means not applicable.

COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager Narrative. A short, factual narrative statement is required for all assessments regardless of rating (e.g., even satisfactory ratings require narrative support. Cross-reference the comments in this block to their corresponding evaluation area listed above. Each narrative statement in support of the area assessment must contain objective data. An exceptional cost performance assessment could, for example, cite the current underrun dollar value and estimate at completion. A marginal engineering design/support assessment could, for example, be supported by information concerning personnel changes. Key engineers familiar with the effort may have been replaced by less experienced engineers. Sources of data include operational test and evaluation results; technical interchange meetings; or production readiness reviews.

A. TECHNICAL (Quality of Product). This element is comprised of six sub-elements: product performance, systems engineering, software engineering, logistics/sustainment, product assurance, and other technical performance. Activity critical to successfully complying with contract requirements must be assessed within one or more of these sub-elements. This element is the COTR's/ Technical Rep's/Program Manager's integrated assessment as to what most accurately depicts the contractor's technical performance or progress toward meeting requirements. This assessment is not a predetermined roll-up of the sub-element assessments.

1. Product Performance. Assess the achieved product performance relative to that required by the contract.

2. Systems Engineering. Assess the contractor's effort to transform operational needs and requirements into an integrated system design solution. Areas of focus should be: the planning and control of technical program tasks, the quality and adequacy of the engineering support provided throughout all phases of contract execution, the integration of the engineering specialties, management of interfaces, and the management of a totally integrated effort of all engineering concerns to meet cost, technical performance, and schedule objectives. System engineering activities ensure that integration of these engineering concerns is addressed upfront and early in the design/development process. The assessment should cover these disciplines: systems architecture, design, manufacturing, integration and support, configuration control, documentation, test and evaluation. The assessment for test and evaluation should consider success/problems/failure in developing test and evaluation objectives; planning (ground/air/sea) test, simulations and/or demonstrations; in accomplishing those objectives and on the timeliness of coordination and feedback of the test results (simulations/demonstrations) into the design and/or manufacturing process. Other activities include: producibility engineering, logistics support analysis, supportability considerations (maintenance personnel/skills availability or work-hour constraints, operating and cost constraints, allowable downtime, turn-around-time to service/maintain the system, standardization requirements) survivability, human factors, reliability, quality, maintainability, availability, inspectability, etc. Although some of these activities will be specifically addressed in other elements/sub-elements (such as product assurance), the focus of the assessment of systems engineering is on the integration of those specific disciplines/activities. The assessment of systems engineering needs to remain flexible to allow the evaluator to account for *program unique technical* concerns and to allow for the changing systems engineering environment as a program moves through the program phases, e.g., Engineering and Manufacturing Development, Production.

3. Software Engineering. Assess the contractor's success in meeting contract requirements for software development, modification, or maintenance. Consider the amount and quality of software development resources devoted to support the contract effort. Results from Software Capability Evaluations (SCEs) [using the Software Engineering Institute (SEI's) Capability Maturity Model (CMM) as a means of measurement], Software Development Capability Evaluations (SDCEs), or similar software assessments may be used as a source of information to support this evaluation.

4. Logistic Support/Sustainment. Assess the success of the contractor's performance in accomplishing integrated logistics support (ILS) program tasks, e.g., maintenance planning; manpower and personnel; supply support; support equipment; technical provisioning data; training and support; computer resources support; facilities; packaging, handling, storage and transportation; and design interface; and the contractor's performance of logistics support analysis activities and the contractor's ability to successfully support fielded equipment. When the contract requires technical/engineering data deliverables, the cognizant cataloging/standardization activity comments should be solicited.

5. Product Assurance. Assess how successfully the contractor meets program quality objectives; e.g., producibility, reliability, maintainability, inspectability, testability. The COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager must be flexible in how contractor success is measured; e.g., data from design test/operational testing successes, field reliability and maintainability and failure reports, user comments and acceptance rates, improved subcontractor and vendor quality, and scrap and rework rates. These quantitative indicators may be useful later, for example, in source selection evaluations, in demonstrating continuous improvement, quality and reliability leadership that reflects progress in total quality management. Assess the contractor's control of the overall manufacturing process to include material control, shop floor planning and control, statusing and control, factory floor optimization, factory design, and factory performance.

6. Other Technical Performance. Assess all the other technical activity critical to successful contract performance. Identify any additional assessment aspects that are unique to the contract or that cannot be captured in another sub-element.

B. SCHEDULE. Assess the timeliness of the contractor against the completion of the contract, task orders, milestones, delivery schedules, administrative requirements, etc. Assess the contractor's adherence to the required delivery schedule by assessing the contractor's efforts during the assessment period that contribute to or effect the schedule variance. Also, address significance of scheduled events (e.g., design reviews), discuss causes, and assess the effectiveness of contractor corrective actions.

C. COST CONTROL. Assess the contractor's effectiveness in forecasting, managing, and controlling contract cost. Assess for all contracts except Firm Fixed Price or Fixed Price with Economic Price Adjustment contracts. Assess current cost performance if the contract is greater than 10 percent complete. Is the contractor experiencing cost growth or underrun? If so, discuss the causes and contractor-proposed solutions for the cost overruns. For contracts where task or contract sizing is based upon contractor provided person-hour estimates, the relationship of these estimates to ultimate task cost should be assessed. In addition, the extent to which the contractor demonstrates a sense of cost responsibility, through the efficient use of resources in each work effort, should be assessed.

D. MANAGEMENT. This element is associated with three sub-elements: Management Responsiveness, Subcontract Management, and Program Management/Other Management. Activity critical to successfully executing the contract must be assessed within one or more of the sub-elements. This element is the program manager's integrated assessment as to what most accurately depicts the contractor's performance in managing the contracted effort. This assessment is not a predetermined roll-up of the sub-element assessments.

1. Management Responsiveness. Assess the timeliness, completeness and quality of problem identification, corrective action plans, proposal submittals (especially responses to change orders, ECPs, or other undefinitized contract actions), the contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior, effective business relations, and customer satisfaction. Assess the contractor's responsiveness to the program needs during the period covered by the report.

2. Subcontract Management. Assess the contractor's success with timely award and management of subcontracts, including whether the contractor met small/small disadvantaged and women-owned business participation goals. Identify the percentage of the contract work that was represented by subcontracted efforts, and assess the prime contractor's effort devoted to managing subcontracts and whether subcontractors were an integral part of the contractor's team. Consider efforts taken to ensure early identification of subcontract problems and the timely application of corporate resources to preclude subcontract problems from impacting overall prime contractor performance.

3. Program Management and Other Management. Assess the extent to which the contractor discharges its responsibility for integration and coordination for all activity needed to execute the contract as documented by the Integrated Master Plan/Schedule; identifies and applies resources required to meet schedule requirements; assigns responsibility for tasks/actions required by contract; communicates appropriate information to affected program elements in a timely manner. Assess the adequacy of the contractor's mechanisms for tracking contract compliance, recording changes to planning documentation and management of cost and schedule control system, and internal controls. Assess the contractor's risk management practices, especially the ability to identify risks and formulate and implement risk mitigation plans. Assess the contractor's performance relative to management of data collection, recording, and distribution as required by the contract. If applicable, identify any other areas that are unique to the contract, or that cannot be captured elsewhere under the Management element.

E. OTHER AREAS. Specify additional evaluation areas that are unique to the contract, or that cannot be captured elsewhere on the form. More than one type of entry may be included, but should be separately labeled.

Use this area for instances where the COTR/Technical Rep/Program Manager believes strongly, either positively or negatively, regarding an aspect of the contractor's performance, but cannot fit that aspect into any of the other areas. As an example, this area may be used to address security issues, provide an assessment of provisioning line items or other areas decreed appropriate.

F. EVALUATOR STATEMENT. Check the statement which best applies to the contract evaluation.

NARRATIVES GUIDELINES

- Address contractor performance: Recent, Relevant
- Collect input from entire program/project team
- Provide reader a complete understanding of contractor's performance
- Narrative required for each rated element
- Address: Rating changes from prior reports, Benefit/impact to Government
- Recognize: Risk inherent in effort, Government's role in contractor's inability to meet requirements
- Indicate major/minor strengths/weaknesses
- Consistent with: Program metrics, Ratings, Contract objectives
- Document problems and solutions
- Contain nonpersonal and objective statements

Below are samples of narratives.

NOT Sufficient
Quality – Rating: Exceptional
The contractor is exceptional. They continually provide high-quality training and services.

The above narrative is missing details to support rating; details to tell entire story; supporting documentation/metrics.

Sufficient
Quality – Rating: Exceptional
Contractor has provided exceptional quality to our 40 worldwide locations during this reporting period. For example, ST requirements were changed and Contractor adjusted to providing 15 training sessions per month versus 10 without additional cost through use of an "express setup" module that requires less instructor preparation time. This allowed users to be trained 3 months more quickly than required. The contractor also aggressively represented the government's interest in dealing with their vendor to correct a system software malfunction. They worked with the vendor to revise the terms and conditions of the warranty clause to correct errors with no cost to the government. They also implemented a new risk management system that reduced potential risk actions by 50%. This also saved the government considerable stress and ensured a constant throughput of aircrew members trained.

NOT Sufficient
Quality – Rating: Very Good
In our opinion, the contractor has done really well in terms of schedule. The Training Manager, Jack Jones, is pleasant and easy to work with. He adapts to our schedule changes amazingly and never complains. He also went above and beyond and fixed our printer and fax without charging the government and he continued to meet all the contract objectives in the interim. Great job!

The above narrative is missing details to support rating; supporting documentation/metrics; used individual's name; work is outside the contract scope; subjective phrases.

Statements to Avoid "Outside Contract Scope" "In Our Opinion" "It Appeared" "We Believe" "We Hope" "We Were Not Happy" "We Did Not Like" "We Think"